

## REMARKS

The Applicant has received and reviewed the Official Action mailed by the Office on 6 June 2005 (hereinafter, the “Action”). The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections as stated in the Action, and favorable of the subject application. Claims 1-3 and 7-19 are pending in the application after entry of the above revisions.

## **Objections to the Drawings**

In response to the objection to the Drawings as stated in Paragraph 1 of the Action, the Applicant has revised Figure 8 as indicated on the enclosed replacement sheet. More particularly, the Applicant has replaced the reference “801” corresponding to the Cancel Icon with the reference “808”. The Applicant has also revised the corresponding description of Figure 8 in the specification accordingly. No new matter is entered. The Applicant thus requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the Drawings as stated in Paragraph 1 of the Action.

In response to the objection to the Drawings as stated in Paragraph 2 of the Action, the Applicant has revised page 11, line 29 to refer to step “613”, rather than step “515”. Since the Applicant is making the specification consistent with the drawings, no new matter is entered. The Applicant thus requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the Drawings as stated in Paragraph 2 of the Action.

In response to the objection to the Drawings as stated in Paragraph 3 of the Action, the Applicant has revised the specification as follows.

The Applicant has amended page 8, line 4, of the specification to insert the reference sign “100” that appears in Figure 1. It is clear from the context of the

1 drawing figures and the description that the reference sign 100 refers to the printer  
2 devices. Thus, no new matter is entered.

3 The Applicant has amended page 8, line 26, of the specification to include  
4 the reference sign “209” that appears in Figure 2. It is clear from the context of  
5 the drawing figures and the description that the reference sign 209 refers to the  
6 line connecting the printer 200 and the client computer 208 as shown in Figure 2.  
7 Thus, no new matter is entered.

8 The Applicant has amended page 9, line 2, of the specification to include  
9 the reference sign “300” that appears in Figure 3. It is clear from the context of  
10 the drawing figures and the description that the reference sign 300 refers to the  
11 printer as shown in Figure 3. Thus, no new matter is entered.

12 Based on the foregoing, the Applicant thus requests reconsideration and  
13 withdrawal of the objection to the Drawings as stated in Paragraph 3 of the Action.

14 The Applicant also submits a replacement drawing sheet for Figure 5, to  
15 address an informality noted by the Applicant when reviewing the instant  
16 application. It appears to the Applicant that the reference sign “207” appearing in  
17 Figure 5 should instead read “202”, for consistency with the ports 202 as shown in  
18 Figure 2. No new matter is entered.

19 **Objections to the Specification**

20 In response to the objections to the specification stated in Paragraph 4 of  
21 the Action, the Applicant has amended the indicated portions of the specification  
22 to address the informalities noted in the Action. The Applicant has also addressed  
23 other informalities noted by the Applicant in reviewing the instant application. No  
24 new matter is entered. The Applicant thus requests reconsideration and

25

1 withdrawal of the objections to the specification as stated in Paragraph 4 of the  
2 Action.

3 **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

4 Paragraph 5 of the Action stated § 102(e) rejections of claims 1-4, 10,  
5 12-15, 17-20, 22, and 24 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,285,461 to Fuji,  
6 et al. (hereinafter, “Fuji”). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of  
7 these claims for the reasons set forth below.

8 While Applicant generally disagrees with the rejections, the Applicant has  
9 amended **independent claims 1 and 7** to clarify further features described in the  
10 Applicant’s specification. As a result, the §102(e) rejections of these independent  
11 claims as based on Fuji are believed moot, and the Applicant respectfully requests  
12 withdrawal of these §102 rejections.

13 Turning first to **independent claim 1**, the Applicant has amended it to  
14 clarify further features of a client computer device. For convenience, claim 1 is  
15 reproduced here, after entry of the above revisions, with emphasis added for ease  
16 of discussion:

17  
18 “1. (Currently Amended) A client computer device comprising:

19 a user interface having a visual display unit;

20  
21 at least one communications port for communicating between the client computer device  
22 and a plurality of printer devices;

23  
24 driver means for driving said printer devices, wherein the driver means are adapted to  
25 request a first print preview of a print job from a first printer device, and to request at least a second

1 print preview of the print job from at least a second printer device, wherein the first print preview  
2 represents a first preview of the print job as printed on the first printer device, and *wherein the*  
3 *second print preview represents a second preview of the print job as printed on the second printer*  
4 *device, wherein the second printer device is configured differently than the first printer device,*  
5 *such that the first print preview differs from the second print preview;*

6 browser means for displaying, *within the user interface, the first print preview and the*  
7 *second print preview to a user, so as to enable the user to select at least one of the first printer*  
8 *device and the second printer device to print the print job.”*

9  
10 The revisions to claim 1 are believed fully supported under 35  
11 U.S.C. § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, at least by page 12, lines 16-26, of the Applicant's  
12 specification.

13 Turning to the cited art, Fuji pertains generally to an image output system  
14 having preview function and method of displaying preview image in image output  
15 system. The Applicant submits that Fuji does not disclose a plurality of printer  
16 devices. Moreover, the Applicant submits that Fuji does not disclose the features  
17 recited in claim 1 that are emphasized above.

18 On at least the foregoing basis, the Applicant submits that Fuji does not  
19 support a § 102(e) rejection of claim 1 as indicated above. Therefore, the  
20 Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of  
21 claim 1.

22 Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, and stand rejected under similar grounds.  
23 Claims 2-3 are amended for consistency with claim 1 as revised above.  
24 Accordingly, the comments directed above to claim 1 apply equally to claims 2-3.  
25

1 On at least this basis, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of  
2 the § 102(e) rejection of claims 2-3.

3 Claim 4 is cancelled without waiver, prejudice, or disclaimer of the  
4 Applicant's rights to direct claims to the subject matter formerly recited therein in  
5 the future.

6 Turning to **independent claim 10**, the Applicant has revised this claim to  
7 clarify further features of the method. The revisions to claim 10 are similar to  
8 those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Accordingly, the above  
9 comments directed to claim 1 apply equally to claim 10. On at least the foregoing  
10 basis, the Applicant submits that Fuji does not support a § 102(e) rejection of  
11 claim 10, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of  
12 claim 10.

13 Claims 12-15 and 17-19 depend from claim 10, and stand rejected on  
14 similar grounds. Claims 12 and 16-19 are amended for consistency with claim 10  
15 as amended above. Accordingly, the above comments directed to claim 10 apply  
16 equally to claims 12 and 16-19, and the Applicant requests reconsideration and  
17 withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejections of claims 12 and 16-19.

18 Claims 20-28 are cancelled without waiver, prejudice, or disclaimer of the  
19 Applicant's rights to direct claims to the subject matter formerly recited therein in  
20 the future.

21 **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

22 **Rejections Based on Fuji and Cooper**

23 As stated in Paragraph 6 on page 10 of the Action, claims 7-9 stand rejected  
24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuji, in view of U.S. Patent  
25

1 No. 6,816,270 to Cooper, et al. (hereinafter, "Cooper"). The Applicant  
2 respectfully traverses these rejections.

3 Turning first to **independent claim 7**, the Applicant has amended claim 7  
4 to clarify further features of the system. The revisions to claim 7 are similar to  
5 those made to independent claims 1 and 10 as discussed above, and all comments  
6 directed to claims 1 and 10 above apply equally to claim 7.

7 Turning to the cited art, the Applicant agrees with the assessment on  
8 Page 10 of the Action that Fuji does not disclose expressly a plurality of printer  
9 devices. Accordingly, the Action cited Figure 1 of Cooper for this teaching in  
10 supporting the § 103(a) rejections of claims 7-9. However, without conceding that  
11 Fuji provides the teaching for which it is cited in the Action, the Applicant submits  
12 that Fuji also fails to teach or suggest the following features as recited in claim 7:

13 "at least two of the printer devices being configured differently from one another, wherein  
14 the preview generation means of a first one of said two printer devices generates a first print  
15 preview for the print job, and wherein the preview generation means of at least a second one of said  
16 two printer devices generates a second print preview for the print job, wherein the first print  
17 preview is different from the second print preview;" and

18 "wherein at least one of the client computer devices is adapted to display the first print  
19 preview and the second print preview to a user, so as to enable the user to select at least one of the  
20 first printer device and the second printer device to print the print job."

22 Turning to Cooper, Cooper pertains generally to a method and apparatus for  
23 supporting application and device independent print support. Figure 1 of Cooper  
24 illustrates printers 114, 118, and 116. However, without conceding that Cooper  
25

1 provides the teaching for which it is cited in the Action, the Applicant submits that  
2 Cooper fails to provide the teaching missing from Fuji that is necessary to support  
3 a § 103 rejection of claim 7. More particularly, the Applicant submits that Cooper  
4 neither teaches nor suggests at least the above-quoted features as recited in  
5 claim 7.

6 On at least this basis, the Applicant submits that Fuji and Cooper do not  
7 support a § 103 rejection of claim 7, and thus requests reconsideration and  
8 withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections of claim 7.

9 Claims 8-9 depend from claim 7 and stand rejected under similar grounds.  
10 Claims 8-9 are amended for consistency with claim 7, and the Applicant submits  
11 that that the above comments directed to claim 7 apply equally to claims 8-9. On  
12 at least this basis, the Applicant submits that Fuji and Cooper do not support a  
13 § 103 rejection of claims 8-9, and thus requests reconsideration and withdrawal of  
14 the § 103(a) rejections of claim 8-9.

15 Rejections Based on Fuji and Nagasaka

16 As stated on page 11 of the Action, claims 25-26 stand rejected under 35  
17 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuji, in view of European Patent  
18 Application No. 0930757 to Nagasaka (hereinafter “Nagasaki”). The Applicant  
19 respectfully traverses these rejections.

20 Claims 25-26 have been cancelled to advance prosecution of this  
21 application, and without waiver, prejudice, or disclaimer of the Applicant’s rights  
22 to direct claims to the subject matter recited therein in the future. The Applicant  
23 submits that Nagasaki does not provide the teaching missing from Fuji and/or  
24 Cooper to support either § 102 or § 103 rejections of the claims that remain  
25 pending in this application.

1           As stated on page 16 of the Action, claims 5-6 and 23 stand rejected  
2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuji, in view of Nagasaka.  
3 The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

4           Claims 5-6 and 23 have been cancelled to advance prosecution of this  
5 application, and without waiver, prejudice, or disclaimer of the Applicant's rights  
6 to direct claims to the subject matter recited therein in the future. The Applicant  
7 submits, once again, that Nagasaka does not provide the teaching missing from  
8 Fuji and/or Cooper to support either § 102 or § 103 rejections of the claims that  
9 remain pending in this application.

10           Rejections Based on Fuji and Adamske

11           As stated on page 13 of the Action, claims 27-28 stand rejected under 35  
12 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuji, in view of U.S. Patent  
13 No. 6,615,234 to Adamske, et al. (hereinafter "Adamske"). The Applicant  
14 respectfully traverses these rejections.

15           Claims 27-28 have been cancelled to advance prosecution of this  
16 application, and without waiver, prejudice, or disclaimer of the Applicant's rights  
17 to direct claims to the subject matter recited therein in the future. The Applicant  
18 submits that Adamske does not provide the teaching missing from Fuji and/or  
19 Cooper to support either § 102 or § 103 rejections of the claims that remain  
20 pending in this application.

21           As stated on page 18 of the Action, claims 11 and 21 stand rejected  
22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuji in view of Adamske.  
23 The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

24           Claim 11 depends from independent claim 10, which was discussed above.  
25 Claim 11 was amended above for consistency with the revisions to claim 10.

1      Turning to Adamske in detail, Adamske pertains generally to a system and method  
2      for network-based document delivery. However, without conceding that Adamske  
3      provides the teaching for which it is cited in the Action, the Applicant submits that  
4      Adamske fails to provide the teaching missing from Fuji to support a rejection of  
5      claim 10, from which claim 11 depends. On at least this basis, the Applicant  
6      requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections of claim 11.

7      **Rejections Based on Fuji and Blumberg**

8      As stated on page 20 of the Action, claim 16 stands rejected under 35  
9      U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuji in view of U.S. Patent Application  
10     Publication No. 2003/0140315 to Blumberg, et al. (hereinafter, “Blumberg”). The  
11     Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

12     Claim 16 depends from claim 10, the rejection of which was addressed  
13     above. Therefore, the comments directed above to claim 10 apply equally to  
14     claim 16. In addition, however, without conceding that Blumberg provides the  
15     teaching for which it is cited in the Action, the Applicant submits that Blumberg  
16     fails to provide the teaching missing from Fuji to support a rejection of claim 10.

17     Turning to Blumberg in more detail, Blumberg pertains generally to a print  
18     on demand virtual builder. Even assuming that Blumberg provides the teaching  
19     for which it is cited, for example, Paragraph [0039] of Blumberg fails to provide  
20     the teaching missing from Fuji to support a rejection of claim 10. Based on at  
21     least the foregoing, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of  
22     the § 103 rejection of claim 16.

23      **Conclusion**

24      The Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103  
25      rejections of claims 1-9, 11-16, and 22-30. If any issue remains unresolved that

1 would prevent allowance of this case, the Office is requested to contact the  
2 undersigned attorney to arrange a telephone interview.

3  
4 Respectfully Submitted,  
5  
6 By: David S. Thompson

7  
8 David S. Thompson  
9 Reg. No. 37,954  
Attorney for Applicant

10 LEE & HAYES PLLC  
11 Suite 500  
12 421 W. Riverside Avenue  
Spokane, Washington 99201  
Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235  
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

## **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The Applicant submits herewith replacement drawing figures for Figures 5 and 8.

Figure 5 is amended to replace the reference numeral “207” with the reference numeral “202”, for consistency with Fig. 2. As such, no new matter is entered.

Figure 8 is amended to replace the reference numeral “801”, formerly designating the cancel icon, with the reference numeral “808”, to address the duplicate references “801” formerly appearing in Figure 8. Corresponding revisions are made to the description of Figure 8, as indicated in the amendments to the specification appearing above. As such, no new matter is entered.